UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/488,394	01/20/2000	Aravind Sitaraman	062891.0327	4403

5073   7590   09/14/2006

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
2001 ROSS AVENUE
SUITE 600
DALLAS, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, DUSTIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 09/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

<table>
<tr>
<td rowspan="2">Office Action Summary</td>
<td>Application No.
09/488,394</td>
<td>Applicant(s)
SITARAMAN ET AL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examiner
Dustin Nguyen</td>
<td>Art Unit
2154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</table>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 June 2006</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-46</u> is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) <u>2,5,12,19,21,27,33,37 and 41</u> is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1,3,4,6-11,13-18,20,22-26,28-32,34-36,38-40 and 42-46</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1 – 46 are presented for examination.

Allowable Subject Matter

2.   Claims 2, 5, 12, 19, 21, 27, 33, 37, and 41 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected

base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments filed 06/27/2006 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

4.   As per remarks, Applicants' argued that (1) Yamamoto and Ohkura, alone or in

combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest "a memory coupled to the access server and

operable to store path information for the plurality of subscribers, the path information for the

particular subscriber identifying a virtual circuit that is pre-assigned to the particular subscriber

for communicating with the access server".

5.   As to point (1), Yamamoto discloses a memory [i.e. external storage unit stores various

tables] [17, Figure 7; and col 6, lines 54-col 7, lines 20] coupled to the access server [i.e. path

setting server] [1, Figure 7; and col 6, lines 37-46] and operable to store path information for

the plurality of subscribers [i.e. VPI, VCI, shelf No., card No., circuit No.] [Figure 14; and col

6, lines 58-65], the path information for the particular subscriber identifying a virtual circuit that

is pre-assigned to the particular subscriber for communicating with the access server [i.e. the

ATM-HUB unit has previously set paths between the subscriber terminals and the path setting

management server] [Abstract; and col 2, lines 14-33].

6.   As per remarks, Applicants' argued that (2) Yamamoto and Ohkura, alone or in

combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest "identify the particular subscriber for connection

to the second communication network based on the comparison".

7.   As to point (2), Yamamoto discloses the ATM-SW unit sets a path between the STB

terminal of the subscriber and the called video server so as to connect them to each other [i.e.

identify the particular subscriber for connection to the second communication network] [col 1,

lines 39-43]. Furthermore, Yamamoto discloses the path setting management server has the

reference table used to detect the port positions for the STB terminal based on the VPI/VCI

values of the ATM cell received from the STB terminal [i.e. identifying the particular subscriber

] [col 9, lines 42-53], and select a video server [col 9, lines 54-59], then informs the STB

terminals that the request is allowed [i.e. for connection to the second communication network]

[col 9, lines 61-67].

8.   As per remarks, Applicants' argued that (3) Yamamoto and Ohkura, alone or in

combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest "compare the path information of the particular

subscriber to the particular virtual circuit used to receive the communication from the particular

subscriber".

9.   As to point (3), Ohkura discloses the above limitation as mentioned in the previous

Office Action. Furthermore, Ohkura discloses the entry data memory stores all the VPIs/VCIs

previously registered [i.e. the path information of the particular subscriber] and performs

VPI/VCI comparison for normal ATM cells entered to the OAM processing device [i.e. the

particular virtual circuit used to receive the communication from the particular subscriber] [

Abstract; and col 7, lines 8-12].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

11.   Claims 1, 3, 4, 8-11, 13-18, 20, 24-26, 28-32, 36, 40, 42-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto [US Patent No 6,111,882], in view of Ohkura et

al. [US Patent No 5,973,045].

12.   As per claim 1, Yamamoto discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a

system for a identify a subscriber, comprising:

an access server [i.e. path setting management server] [Figure 7; and col 6, lines 37-57]

coupled to a plurality of subscribers [i.e. STB terminals] [4, Figures 4 and 5; and col 5, lines

33-58] using a first communication network [i.e. access system] [6, Figures 4 and 5; and col 5,

lines 11-32] and further coupled to a second communication network [i.e. video server] [3,

Figures 4 and 5; and col 4, lines 57-65], the access server operable to receive a communication

from a particular subscriber using a particular one of a plurality of virtual circuits associated with

the first communication network [i.e. the path setting management server determines, based on

the receive VPI/VCI, from which the STB terminal the request has been transmitted] [col 9,

lines 43-45];

a memory coupled to the access server [i.e. storage] [Figure 7; and col 6, lines 37-57]

and operable to store path information for the plurality of subscribers [i.e. VPI, VCI, shelf No.,

card No., circuit No.] [Figure 14; and col 6, lines 58-65], the path information for the particular

subscriber identifying a virtual circuit that is pre-assigned to the particular subscriber for

communicating with the access server [i.e. the path setting management server has the reference

table used to detect the port positions on the ATM-HUB unit and the VPI/VCI values of the

VD/CD channels for the STB terminal based on the VPI/VCI values of the ATM cell received

from the STB terminal] [col 9, lines 42-67]; and

a processor coupled to the memory [i.e. controller] [11, Figure 7; and col 6, lines 37-44

]; and

identifying the particular subscriber for connection to the second communication network

based on the comparison [i.e. the path setting management server detects the port position on the

video server side and the VPI/VCI values of the VC/CT channels, the path setting management

server informs the STB terminals that the request is allowed] [col 9, lines 54-col 10, lines 35].

Yamamoto does not specifically disclose

compare the path information for the particular subscriber to the particular virtual circuit

used to received the communication from the particular subscriber.

Ohkura discloses

compare the path information for the particular subscriber to the particular virtual circuit

used to received the communication from the particular subscriber [i.e. VPI/VCI extractor

extracts VPI/VCI of the incoming ATM cell and compares it with the previous registered

VPI/VCI records] [col 2, lines 1-15; and col 4, lines 27-34].

It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to combine the teaching of Yamamoto and Ohkura because Ohkura's teaching of comparing

VPI/VCI would allow to verify the incoming VPI/VCI of the subscriber [Ohkura, col 2, lines 1-

15].

13.   As per claim 3, Yamamoto discloses the access server comprises

an interface coupled to the particular subscriber using the particular virtual circuit [i.e.

ATM-HUB] [Figure 8; and col 7, lines 21-55]; and

a controller coupled to the interface and operable to communicate a request identifying

the particular virtual circuit that couples the interface and the particular subscriber [i.e. ATM-

HUB controller] [22, Figure 8; and col 7, lines 21-55].

14.   As per claim 4, Yamamoto discloses the interface comprises a plurality of network line

cards, the path information for the particular subscriber further identifies a network line card

assigned to the particular subscriber; and the processor is further operable to identify the

particular subscriber based upon the path information for the particular subscriber and an

identifier of a particular network line card coupled to the particular subscriber [i.e. ATM-HUB

port No, shelf No., card No., circuit No.] [Figure 14; col 4, lines 31-46; and col 6, lines 58-63].

15.   As per claim 8, Yamamoto discloses the particular virtual circuit is associated with the

particular subscriber using a virtual channel identifier and a virtual path identifier [Figure 5; and

col 6, lines 54-65].

16.   As per claim 9, Yamamoto discloses a virtual path identifier and a virtual channel

identifier associated with the virtual circuit assigned to the particular subscriber [col 5, lines 11-

57].

17.   As per claim 10, Yamamoto discloses the access server supports a communication

session between the particular subscriber and the second communication network in response to

identifying the particular subscriber [i.e. the path setting management server requests the

controller of the ATM-HUB to set a path between the subscriber terminal and the media server]

[Abstract].

18.   As per claims 11 and 13, they are method claimed of claims 1 and 3, they are rejected for

similar reasons as stated above in claims 1 and 3.

19.   As per claim 14, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 4.

20.   As per claims 15-17, they are method claimed of claims 8-10, they are rejected for

similar reasons as stated above in claims 8-10.

21.   As per claim 18, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1.

22.   As per claim 20, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 4.

23.   As per claims 24, 25, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 8, 9.

24.   As per claims 26 and 28, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1

and 3.

25.   As per claim 29, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 4.

26.   As per claims 30 and 31, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 8

and 9.

27.   As per claim 32, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1, 3, and 10.

Furthermore, Yamamoto discloses an interface, a controller and a route processor [Figures 7 and

8; col 6, lines 21-55].

28.   As per claim 36, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated in claims 1 and 10.

29.   As per claims 40 and 42, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1

and 3.

30.   As per claim 43, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 4.

31.   As per claims 44-46, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 8-10.

32.   Claims 6, 7, 22, 23, 34, 35, 38 and 39are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Yamamoto [US Patent No 6,111,882], in view of Ohkura et al. [US Patent

No 5,973,045], and further in view of Nessett et al. [US Patent No 5,968,176].

33.   As per claim 6, Yamamoto and Ohkura do not specifically disclose the request comprises

a RADIUS protocol request. Nessett discloses the request comprises a RADIUS protocol request

[col 13, lines 32-38]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teaching of Yamamoto, Ohkura and Nessett because the

teaching of RADIUS of Nessett reference would allow access control functionality such as proxy

interaction with authentication, authorization, and audit servers [Nessett, col 13, lines 32-35].

34.   As per claim 7, Nessett discloses the request comprises a trivial file transfer protocol

request [col 17, lines 45-49].

35.   As per claims 22 and 23, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 6

and 7.

36.   As per claims 34 and 35, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 6

and 7.

37.   As per claims 38 and 39, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 6

and 7.

38.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-5321. The

examiner can normally be reached on flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Follansbee John can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dustin Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2154

JOHN FOX LANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100